

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/784,952	ONO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin M Bernatz	1773	

All Participants:

(1) Kevin M Bernatz.

(2) Mr. David Zibelli.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 April 2005
Time: PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

see Notice of Allowance

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

see Notice of Allowance

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Examiner indicated that the prior Office action was being withdrawn and prosecution reopened since applicants' arguments were convincing in view of the rejections of record. The Examiner indicated that several references which would be made of record indicated that adding nitrogen to a DLC protective layer was known in the art, as was the desire to functionalize the surface of a protective layer to improve adhesion to a functionalized fluorinated lubricant. However, the Examiner noted that the prior art did not appear to recognize the showing of unexpected results when a combination of a DLC film containing Nitrogen atoms was controlled to have a concentration of specified surface functional groups, as shown by applicants in Figure 3 and pages 14 - 19. The Examiner suggested amending the claims to be commensurate in scope with the showing of unexpected results, thereby bringing the case into condition for allowance. Applicants agreed to the proposed changes.